



BY AUTHORITY.

## HAWAIIAN GAZETTE

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL,  
DEVOTED TO HAWAIIAN PROGRESS.

PUBLISHED AND EDITED BY  
HENRY M. WHITNEY.  
GEORGE H. DOLE, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 1877.

### The Hawaiian Treaty.

"Every intelligent person on the Pacific Coast knows that the treaty is open and ready to be ratified by the two governments, which control the plantations at the Islands. Every one knows, too, that the king is making immense sums, that the government is losing a very large revenue, and that consumers are paying more for the same articles than they did before the treaty went into effect. At this rate, the king will be a hundred and twenty thousand dollars a year, and all San Francisco is many times greater. All this, and the increased price besides, according to half as much more, is transferred to the consumer, and the king is the gainer. The whole mass of portland, who have dealt largely on these sugars, but whose trade has been practically cut off by the treaty and transferred to the San Francisco ring, can answer fully for these losses. The king is the gainer, and the effect of the treaty has been to enhance the price of sugars at the expense of consumers and the government."

There are certain writers on the coast who hesitate not to take every occasion to decry the workings of our treaty with the United States, and to employ direct misrepresentation and falsehood in their efforts to render it unpopular with the masses. The above extract from a Portland paper is an illustration of this. It is not true "that the treaty operates solely in the interest of a sugar ring at San Francisco." Every American, and every cent of American capital which is now, or may be hereafter, invested in sugar plantations in this country, does and will participate in the advantages of the treaty. No sensible person ever believed that the free introduction of the small contribution of Hawaii to the sugar product of the world, into the United States could affect prices in that country. The treaty was accepted by the United States government, not for any pecuniary considerations, but as a matter of national policy, and the considerations which led to its adoption are bound to grow in importance year by year. The statement that a "sugar ring" at San Francisco "controls the plantations of the islands," is another which is devoid of a shadow of truth. The owners of the Sugar Refineries in San Francisco hold an interest in one sugar plantation in this country, and their "control" is limited to that. The greater number of plantations here are owned in the country, are out of debt, and are subject to no control outside of that exercised by their owners. It is true that a small proportion of the sugar crop is sold to the San Francisco refiners, but whenever the merchants of Portland or any other parties offer better terms they will get the sugar. With such armies as these two Powers command nothing is easier than to overrun a country and capture small posts and detachments. But the decisive actions wipe away all such things. The disastrous failure of three successive Russian assaults on Korea would seem to show that the Turkish War Department has not neglected the work of preparation. During the Crimean war Korea was heroically defended by a British general, and the English engineers left the mark of their skill in the fortifications. Thus far there have been no battles in the open field, the Turkish victory at Balaklava being in fortified lines. Vast as the Russian armies are it is doubtful whether they can endure the loss of life incident to long sieges and the destructive diseases peculiar to Asia Minor. So far as we can perceive, however, the Russian aim is to occupy and retain Armenia permanently, which would require the Turks to assume the aggressive and fight a decisive battle in order to oust the Russians.—Phil. N. Am.

**History of the Lahaina Sugar Cane.**

To THE EDITOR OF THE HAWAIIAN GAZETTE:—The justly acknowledged superiority of the "Lahaina cane" warrants a correct statement of the facts regarding its origin. In 1854 Captain Edwards of the whaling-ship George Washington brought from Tahiti the two varieties of cane, now commonly known as the "Cuban" and the "Lahaina." This seed was intended for Mr. Tolson, a Kanai planter; but the ship first calling at Lahaina, Mr. Chase, U. S. Consul resident, obtained possession of it and planted it in his Lahaina garden. Two or three years later Mr. Tolson obtained from these ratings of the "Cuban," and this was the variety which he chose for his own; and this was the variety which he sold to others. It is now known that the Great Republic can bestow upon them can be deemed disproportionate. But that the English people should consider such unparalleled honors as he has been the recipient of during his recent visit, was wholly unexpected. From the moment of his arrival at Liverpool when he was surprised "to find nearly all the shipping decorated with the flags of all nations, and from the mainmast of each, the flag of our Union the most conspicuous," his progress has been a right royal one. Dances, fêtes, breakfasts, suppers, balls, toasts, compliments, praises, and honors generally while a hereditary monarch might covet, have been lavished upon him. With the modesty which has ever been a characteristic of the man, General Grant regards this ovation as an exhibition of the honor and respect which Englishmen feel for the United States. Says he in a letter to a friend at home, "I appreciate the fact, and am proud of it, that the attentions I am receiving are intended more for our country than for me personally." But it cannot be denied that personal merit and renown have even more to do with it than sentiments of national friendship. The English esteem him because he is the foremost man of America; a soldier never defeated; a victorious General who did not forget in the moment of victory the generosity of the soldier and the tone of the gentleman toward his less fortunate antagonist; who fought to conquer but not to subdue; who strove to convert enemies into friends; who, during eight years of civil rule as the Chief Magistrate of his country, did not soil his hands with his spoils; and although betrayed in his trust did not betray his friends or his country."

But perhaps the most flattering ovation yet given, and the one most calculated to excite American pride in the mother country, was the reception of General Grant and wife at the Royal Italian Opera House in London, on the 22nd of June. The telegraph says that when the distinguished guests entered the theatre, the curtain rose, disclosing the accomplished actress Albiani with a full chorus of her company, behind whom was an array of American flags. The prima donna sang the Star Spangled Banner, supported in the chorus by her orchestra. On the General's entry into the theatre the vast audience rose and stood while the American National hymn was sung, as did he and his party, and when the singing was ended an outburst of cheers, such as an English audience only can give, greeted their distinguished guests. Altogether it eclipsed, as a torching popular ovation, every demonstration yet shown to him.

Again, the Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age. But the Court say that the defendant, in the opinion of the Court and of J. K. Davies, is not a Hawaiian, the observation made to reference to Charles, the Japanese, apply to this case.

Kabel. The Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age.

The question arises as to whether his contract is valid, or not, as also those of the remaining seven. These had appeared on two occasions.

In. Whether the contract could be acknowledged before a Notary Public?

Ind. Whether the contract should not be signed by both parties in the Native and English parts of the contract?

It had been decided, in the case of Wm. vs. Kabel, April 10, 1877, that the law in this case must be to deliver a copy to the laborer. By the Statute of 1875 it would seem to be implied that the copies of such contracts were intended; but the contracts before the Court were made before that date.

The law of 1865 made it obligatory that the contracts should be executed in the Native and English language, and one copy of each of these contracts being executed legally, was sufficient. The laborer could acknowledge of this copy if he desired.

These had signed the contracts, as they had agreed, and if their employers should withhold their payment for a year, it would be as worse that the laborers now returning to work, would they not say the laborers had been defrauded? The laborers had agreed to pay it was not strong, that this was to be done.

If they were released in any way, the Supreme Court would never issue a final award to their complaints; but, after having worked a year, they could not be compelled to do so.

The Court cannot listen to such appeals; these men knew they had signed the contracts in both languages, and must go back to their employers, and the judgment of the lower Court is affirmed.

the workingmen of the metropolis waited upon him. It consisted of delegates from the Trades societies and political associations of London, who having deeply sympathized with the Federal cause during the American war, desired to express to the Ex-President a grateful sense of the value of the services he then rendered to the cause of human freedom.

### The Oriental Struggle.

"Every intelligent person on the Pacific Coast knows that the treaty is open and ready to be ratified by the two governments, which control the plantations at the Islands. Every one knows, too, that the king is making immense sums, that the government is losing a very large revenue, and that consumers are paying more for the same articles than they did before the treaty went into effect. At this rate, the king will be a hundred and twenty thousand dollars a year, and all San Francisco is many times greater. All this, and the increased price besides, according to half as much more, is transferred to the consumer, and the king is the gainer. The whole mass of portland, who have dealt largely on these sugars, but whose trade has been practically cut off by the treaty and transferred to the San Francisco ring, can answer fully for these losses. The king is the gainer, and the effect of the treaty has been to enhance the price of sugars at the expense of consumers and the government."

There are certain writers on the coast who

hesitate not to take every occasion to decry the workings of our treaty with the United States, and to employ direct misrepresentation and falsehood in their efforts to render it unpopular with the masses. The above extract from a Portland paper is an illustration of this. It is not true "that the treaty operates solely in the interest of a sugar ring at San Francisco." Every American, and every cent of American capital which is now, or may be hereafter, invested in sugar plantations in this country, does and will participate in the advantages of the treaty. No sensible person ever believed that the free introduction of the small contribution of Hawaii to the sugar product of the world, into the United States could affect prices in that country. The treaty was accepted by the United States government, not for any pecuniary considerations, but as a matter of national policy, and the considerations which led to its adoption are bound to grow in importance year by year. The statement that a "sugar ring" at San Francisco "controls the plantations of the islands," is another which is devoid of a shadow of truth. The owners of the Sugar Refineries in San Francisco hold an interest in one sugar plantation in this country, and their "control" is limited to that. The greater number of plantations here are owned in the country, are out of debt, and are subject to no control outside of that exercised by their owners. It is true that a small proportion of the sugar crop is sold to the San Francisco refiners, but whenever the merchants of Portland or any other parties offer better terms they will get the sugar. With such armies as these two Powers command nothing is easier than to overrun a country and capture small posts and detachments. But the decisive actions wipe away all such things. The disastrous failure of three successive Russian assaults on Korea would seem to show that the Turkish War Department has not neglected the work of preparation. During the Crimean war Korea was heroically defended by a British general, and the English engineers left the mark of their skill in the fortifications. Thus far there have been no battles in the open field, the Turkish victory at Balaklava being in fortified lines. Vast as the Russian armies are it is doubtful whether they can endure the loss of life incident to long sieges and the destructive diseases peculiar to Asia Minor. So far as we can perceive, however, the Russian aim is to occupy and retain Armenia permanently, which would require the Turks to assume the aggressive and fight a decisive battle in order to oust the Russians.—Phil. N. Am.

**History of the Lahaina Sugar Cane.**

To THE EDITOR OF THE HAWAIIAN GAZETTE:

Sir:—The justly acknowledged superiority of the "Lahaina cane" warrants a correct statement of the facts regarding its origin. In 1854 Captain Edwards of the whaling-ship George Washington brought from Tahiti the two varieties of cane, now commonly known as the "Cuban" and the "Lahaina." This seed was intended for Mr. Tolson, a Kanai planter; but the ship first calling at Lahaina, Mr. Chase, U. S. Consul resident, obtained possession of it and planted it in his Lahaina garden. Two or three years later Mr. Tolson obtained from these ratings of the "Cuban," and this was the variety which he chose for his own; and this was the variety which he sold to others. It is now known that the Great Republic can bestow upon them can be deemed disproportionate. But that the English people should consider such unparalleled honors as he has been the recipient of during his recent visit, was wholly unexpected. From the moment of his arrival at Liverpool when he was surprised "to find nearly all the shipping decorated with the flags of all nations, and from the mainmast of each, the flag of our Union the most conspicuous," his progress has been a right royal one. Dances, fêtes, breakfasts, suppers, balls, toasts, compliments, praises, and honors generally while a hereditary monarch might covet, have been lavished upon him. With the modesty which has ever been a characteristic of the man, General Grant regards this ovation as an exhibition of the honor and respect which Englishmen feel for the United States. Says he in a letter to a friend at home, "I appreciate the fact, and am proud of it, that the attentions I am receiving are intended more for our country than for me personally." But it cannot be denied that personal merit and renown have even more to do with it than sentiments of national friendship. The English esteem him because he is the foremost man of America; a soldier never defeated; a victorious General who did not forget in the moment of victory the generosity of the soldier and the tone of the gentleman toward his less fortunate antagonist; who fought to conquer but not to subdue; who strove to convert enemies into friends; who, during eight years of civil rule as the Chief Magistrate of his country, did not soil his hands with his spoils; and although betrayed in his trust did not betray his friends or his country."

But perhaps the most flattering ovation yet given, and the one most calculated to excite American pride in the mother country, was the reception of General Grant and wife at the Royal Italian Opera House in London, on the 22nd of June. The telegraph says that when the distinguished guests entered the theatre, the curtain rose, disclosing the accomplished actress Albiani with a full chorus of her company, behind whom was an array of American flags. The prima donna sang the Star Spangled Banner, supported in the chorus by her orchestra. On the General's entry into the theatre the vast audience rose and stood while the American National hymn was sung, as did he and his party, and when the singing was ended an outburst of cheers, such as an English audience only can give, greeted their distinguished guests. Altogether it eclipsed, as a torching popular ovation, every demonstration yet shown to him.

Again, the Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age. But the Court say that the defendant, in the opinion of the Court and of J. K. Davies, is not a Hawaiian, the observation made to reference to Charles, the Japanese, apply to this case.

Kabel. The Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age.

The question arises as to whether his contract is valid, or not, as also those of the remaining seven. These had appeared on two occasions.

In. Whether the contract could be acknowledged before a Notary Public?

Ind. Whether the contract should not be signed by both parties in the Native and English parts of the contract?

It had been decided, in the case of Wm. vs. Kabel, April 10, 1877, that the law in this case must be to deliver a copy to the laborer. By the Statute of 1875 it would seem to be implied that the copies of such contracts were intended; but the contracts before the Court were made before that date.

The law of 1865 made it obligatory that the contracts should be executed in the Native and English language, and one copy of each of these contracts being executed legally, was sufficient. The laborer could acknowledge of this copy if he desired.

These had signed the contracts, as they had agreed, and if their employers should withhold their payment for a year, it would be as worse that the laborers now returning to work, would they not say the laborers had been defrauded? The laborers had agreed to pay it was not strong, that this was to be done.

But perhaps the most flattering ovation yet given, and the one most calculated to excite American pride in the mother country, was the reception of General Grant and wife at the Royal Italian Opera House in London, on the 22nd of June. The telegraph says that when the distinguished guests entered the theatre, the curtain rose, disclosing the accomplished actress Albiani with a full chorus of her company, behind whom was an array of American flags. The prima donna sang the Star Spangled Banner, supported in the chorus by her orchestra. On the General's entry into the theatre the vast audience rose and stood while the American National hymn was sung, as did he and his party, and when the singing was ended an outburst of cheers, such as an English audience only can give, greeted their distinguished guests. Altogether it eclipsed, as a torching popular ovation, every demonstration yet shown to him.

Again, the Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age. But the Court say that the defendant, in the opinion of the Court and of J. K. Davies, is not a Hawaiian, the observation made to reference to Charles, the Japanese, apply to this case.

Kabel. The Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age.

The question arises as to whether his contract is valid, or not, as also those of the remaining seven. These had appeared on two occasions.

In. Whether the contract could be acknowledged before a Notary Public?

Ind. Whether the contract should not be signed by both parties in the Native and English parts of the contract?

It had been decided, in the case of Wm. vs. Kabel, April 10, 1877, that the law in this case must be to deliver a copy to the laborer. By the Statute of 1875 it would seem to be implied that the copies of such contracts were intended; but the contracts before the Court were made before that date.

The law of 1865 made it obligatory that the contracts should be executed in the Native and English language, and one copy of each of these contracts being executed legally, was sufficient. The laborer could acknowledge of this copy if he desired.

These had signed the contracts, as they had agreed, and if their employers should withhold their payment for a year, it would be as worse that the laborers now returning to work, would they not say the laborers had been defrauded? The laborers had agreed to pay it was not strong, that this was to be done.

But perhaps the most flattering ovation yet given, and the one most calculated to excite American pride in the mother country, was the reception of General Grant and wife at the Royal Italian Opera House in London, on the 22nd of June. The telegraph says that when the distinguished guests entered the theatre, the curtain rose, disclosing the accomplished actress Albiani with a full chorus of her company, behind whom was an array of American flags. The prima donna sang the Star Spangled Banner, supported in the chorus by her orchestra. On the General's entry into the theatre the vast audience rose and stood while the American National hymn was sung, as did he and his party, and when the singing was ended an outburst of cheers, such as an English audience only can give, greeted their distinguished guests. Altogether it eclipsed, as a torching popular ovation, every demonstration yet shown to him.

Again, the Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age. But the Court say that the defendant, in the opinion of the Court and of J. K. Davies, is not a Hawaiian, the observation made to reference to Charles, the Japanese, apply to this case.

Kabel. The Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age.

The question arises as to whether his contract is valid, or not, as also those of the remaining seven. These had appeared on two occasions.

In. Whether the contract could be acknowledged before a Notary Public?

Ind. Whether the contract should not be signed by both parties in the Native and English parts of the contract?

It had been decided, in the case of Wm. vs. Kabel, April 10, 1877, that the law in this case must be to deliver a copy to the laborer. By the Statute of 1875 it would seem to be implied that the copies of such contracts were intended; but the contracts before the Court were made before that date.

The law of 1865 made it obligatory that the contracts should be executed in the Native and English language, and one copy of each of these contracts being executed legally, was sufficient. The laborer could acknowledge of this copy if he desired.

These had signed the contracts, as they had agreed, and if their employers should withhold their payment for a year, it would be as worse that the laborers now returning to work, would they not say the laborers had been defrauded? The laborers had agreed to pay it was not strong, that this was to be done.

But perhaps the most flattering ovation yet given, and the one most calculated to excite American pride in the mother country, was the reception of General Grant and wife at the Royal Italian Opera House in London, on the 22nd of June. The telegraph says that when the distinguished guests entered the theatre, the curtain rose, disclosing the accomplished actress Albiani with a full chorus of her company, behind whom was an array of American flags. The prima donna sang the Star Spangled Banner, supported in the chorus by her orchestra. On the General's entry into the theatre the vast audience rose and stood while the American National hymn was sung, as did he and his party, and when the singing was ended an outburst of cheers, such as an English audience only can give, greeted their distinguished guests. Altogether it eclipsed, as a torching popular ovation, every demonstration yet shown to him.

Again, the Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age. But the Court say that the defendant, in the opinion of the Court and of J. K. Davies, is not a Hawaiian, the observation made to reference to Charles, the Japanese, apply to this case.

Kabel. The Court say in this case that the defendant, who had plighted his troth, had an opportunity of showing in the two trials that he had no proof of his further evidence of fact, and it appeared by his testimony that he had paid taxes as he were of age, and voted, and if he had held out so long, it might be inferred that he was of age.

The question arises as to whether his contract is valid, or not